

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Plaintiff,

v.

FREDERIC A. YURISICH and VERA M.  
YURISICH,  
Defendants.

No. CR-06-058-FVS

ORDER

**THIS MATTER** comes before the Court based upon the defendants' motion to dismiss. Frederic A. Yurisich is represented by Kimberly A. Deater. Vera M. Yurisich is represented by Frank L. Cikutovich. The government is represented by K. Jill Bolton.

**BACKGROUND**

On September 24, 2001, Frederic Yurisich was injured and the vehicle that he was driving was damaged when it was struck by a vehicle that was driven by an employee of the United States Department of Agriculture. Later, Mr. Yurisich underwent shoulder surgery. He and his wife, Vera Yurisich, retained attorney John Brangwin to represent them. He filed a tort action against the United States and, in due course, propounded discovery requests. The United States was represented by Frank Wilson, an Assistant United States Attorney. He arranged for federal investigators to surreptitiously video Mr.

1 Yurisich while he performed a number of activities that required him  
2 to use the surgically repaired shoulder. In addition, Mr. Wilson  
3 noted the depositions of Mr. and Mrs. Yurisich for September 16, 2004.  
4 Prior to their depositions, Mr. Wilson answered Mr. Brangwin's  
5 discovery requests, but he did not disclose the surveillance videos.  
6 Mrs. Yurisich was present at her husband's deposition. Mr. Wilson  
7 questioned him about the range of activities he was capable of  
8 performing. He allegedly testified in a manner inconsistent with the  
9 actions recorded in the surveillance videos. Mr. Wilson also deposed  
10 Mrs. Yurisich. She allegedly confirmed the veracity of her husband's  
11 description of the activities that he was capable of performing. Less  
12 than one week after the depositions, Mr. Wilson disclosed the videos  
13 to Mr. Brangwin. The case settled during December of 2004. On June  
14 6, 2006, the government filed an indictment charging the Yurisiches  
15 with perjury. The indictment is signed by James A. McDevitt, the  
16 United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Washington, and K.  
17 Jill Bolton, an Assistant United States Attorney. The Yurisiches move  
18 to dismiss on the ground the charges are vindictive.  
19

#### 20 **RULING**

21 "[S]o long as the prosecutor has probable cause to believe that  
22 the accused committed an offense defined by statute, the decision  
23 whether or not to prosecute, and what charge to file or bring before a  
24 grand jury, generally rests entirely in his discretion."  
25 *Bordenkircher v. Hayes*, 434 U.S. 357, 364, 98 S.Ct. 663, 668, 54  
26 L.Ed.2d 604 (1978) (hereinafter "*Hayes*"). A prosecutor's charging

1 decisions are cloaked with a "'presumption of regularity.'" *United*  
2 *States v. Armstrong*, 517 U.S. 456, 464, 116 S.Ct. 1480, 1486, 134  
3 L.Ed.2d 687 (1996) (quoting *United States v. Chemical Foundation,*  
4 *Inc.*, 272 U.S. 1, 14, 47 S.Ct. 1, 6, 71 L.Ed. 131 (1926)). The  
5 Supreme Court is disinclined to second-guess a prosecutor's charging  
6 decisions. *Wayte v. United States*, 470 U.S. 598, 607, 105 S.Ct. 1524,  
7 1530, 84 L.Ed.2d 547 (1985) ("the decision to prosecute is  
8 particularly ill-suited to judicial review"). This is especially true  
9 when the disputed decision occurs before trial begins (a decision made  
10 after a conviction has been reversed is a different matter). *United*  
11 *States v. Goodwin*, 457 U.S. 368, 381-82, 102 S.Ct. 2485, 2492-93, 73  
12 L.Ed.2d 74 (1982). Nevertheless, a prosecutor's charging decisions  
13 are subject to constitutional constraints. *Armstrong*, 517 U.S. at  
14 464, 116 S.Ct. at 1486. "To punish a person because he has done what  
15 the law plainly allows him to do is a due process violation of the  
16 most basic sort[.]" *Hayes*, 434 U.S. at 363, 98 S.Ct. at 668. "[T]he  
17 mere filing of an indictment can support a charge of vindictive  
18 prosecution." *United States v. Hooten*, 662 F.2d 628, 634 (9th  
19 Cir.1981), *cert. denied*, 455 U.S. 1004, 102 S.Ct. 1640, 71 L.Ed.2d 873  
20 (1982). If a defendant presents direct evidence of vindictiveness,  
21 the prosecutor must demonstrate that the disputed charging decision  
22 was based upon non-vindictive considerations. See *United States v.*  
23 *Jarrett*, 447 F.3d 520, 525 (7th Cir.2006) (citations omitted). The  
24 Yurisiches have not presented direct evidence of vindictiveness.  
25 Rather, they argue that an appearance of vindictiveness exists; that  
26

1 is to say, the Court should presume the existence of vindictiveness  
2 based upon circumstantial evidence. However, courts have been  
3 reluctant to presume vindictiveness based upon events occurring prior  
4 to trial. *See, e.g., Jarrett*, 447 F.3d at 525 ("Although there are  
5 limited circumstances in which a defendant is entitled to a  
6 burden-shifting presumption of vindictiveness, cases where courts have  
7 found such circumstances have arisen exclusively in the post-trial  
8 context."). In the Ninth Circuit, "the appearance of vindictiveness  
9 results only where, as a practical matter, there is a realistic or  
10 reasonable likelihood of prosecutorial conduct that would not have  
11 occurred but for hostility or a punitive animus towards the defendant  
12 because he has exercised his specific legal rights." *United States v.*  
13 *Gallegos-Curiel*, 681 F.2d 1164, 1169 (9th Cir.1982). If the  
14 Yurisiches make a prima facie showing, the burden shifts to the  
15 government to present evidence that dispels the appearance of  
16 vindictiveness. *Id.* at 1168.

17  
18 The Yurisiches argue that Mr. Wilson violated the Federal Rules  
19 of Civil Procedure by refusing to disclose the videos prior to their  
20 depositions. They insist they suffered prejudice as a result. Since  
21 Mr. Wilson knew the content of the videos, but they did not, he was  
22 able to ask questions whose significance they did not appreciate. In  
23 their opinion, Mr. Wilson's behavior reflects animus toward them.  
24 Moreover, as the record now stands, they do not know whether he played  
25 a role in the decision to seek their indictment. They argue that,  
26 since perjury charges are rare, he must have had some influence on the

1 ultimate decision. They urge the Court to order the government to  
2 disclose the role, if any, played by Mr. Wilson in the decision-making  
3 process and to establish a non-vindictive basis for seeking the  
4 indictment.

5 As noted above, there is no direct evidence of vindictiveness on  
6 the part of Mr. Wilson, Mr. McDevitt, or Ms. Bolton. Instead, the  
7 issue is whether there is circumstantial evidence of vindictiveness.  
8 The Yurisiches argue that vindictiveness may be presumed from Mr.  
9 Wilson's behavior. Consequently, the Yurisiches must demonstrate at  
10 least two things. The first is that it is reasonable to think that  
11 Mr. Wilson acted as he did out of "hostility or punitive animus."  
12 *Gallegos-Curiel*, 681 F.2d at 1169. The second is that a causal  
13 connection exists between Mr. Wilson's alleged attitude and his  
14 colleagues' decision to seek perjury charges.<sup>1</sup>

15  
16 Courts have yet to reach consensus upon whether and, if so, the  
17 point at which surveillance videos must be disclosed. *See, e.g.,*  
18 *Brannan v. Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co.*, 96 Civ. 4142, 1998 WL  
19 229521, at \*1-\*2, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6383, \*3 (S.D.N.Y. May 7,  
20 1998); *Smith v. Diamond Offshore Drilling, Inc.*, 168 F.R.D. 582, 586-

---

21  
22 <sup>1</sup>In *Hartman v. Moore*, 547 U.S. ----, ----, 126 S.Ct. 1695,  
23 1700, 164 L.Ed.2d 441 (2006), the plaintiff alleged that federal  
24 investigators induced an Assistant United States Attorney to seek  
25 criminal charges against him because he criticized the Postal  
26 Service. One of the issues was causation. "Some sort of  
allegation," said the Supreme Court, "is needed both to bridge  
the gap between the nonprosecuting government agent's motive and  
the prosecutor's action, and to address the presumption of  
prosecutorial regularity."

1 87 (S.D.Tex.1996); *Ward v. CSX Transp., Inc.*, 161 F.R.D. 38, 39-41  
2 (E.D.N.C.1995). Even if Mr. Wilson should have sought a protective  
3 order rather than unilaterally withholding the videos until after the  
4 Yurisiches' depositions, the dispute over the videos' disclosure must  
5 be viewed against the record as a whole. The United States admitted  
6 liability for the collision. The parties negotiated in good faith and  
7 reached an amicable settlement. The United States paid \$45,000 to Mr.  
8 Yurisich. According to Mr. Brangwin's testimony, this sum fairly  
9 compensated Mr. Yurisich for the damages he sustained as a result of  
10 the collision. Mr. Brangwin is firmly convinced that the videos had  
11 limited evidentiary value and little or no impact upon the resolution  
12 of Mr. Yurisich's personal injury claim. Given these undisputed  
13 circumstances, it is unrealistic to think that the claim or the  
14 settlement provoked hostility or punitive animus on the part of Mr.  
15 Wilson. The most that can be said is that he aggressively defended  
16 his client, but aggressive lawyering is not the same as hostility or  
17 punitive animus. Since nothing Mr. Wilson said or did creates an  
18 appearance of vindictiveness, there is no need to determine whether  
19 there is a causal connection between his conduct and his colleagues'  
20 decision to seek the Yurisiches' indictment for perjury. The  
21 Yurisiches' motion to dismiss will be denied.<sup>2</sup>

---

23  
24 <sup>2</sup>Some of the issues raised by the Yurisiches' motion might  
25 have been avoided had this case been referred to a prosecutor  
26 outside the Eastern District of Washington for a decision with  
respect to whether to seek an indictment. However, the United  
States Attorney was under no obligation to proceed in this  
manner.

1           **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

2           The defendants' motion to dismiss (**Ct. Rec. 34**) is denied.

3           **IT IS SO ORDERED.** The District Court Executive is hereby  
4 directed to enter this order and furnish copies to counsel.

5           **DATED** this 13th day of November, 2006.

6  
7                               s/ Fred Van Sickle  
8                               Fred Van Sickle  
9                               United States District Judge  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26